

# Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program

---

## *FY 2009 Request for Applications*

---

**Please Note:** As of 12/03/08, page 14 of this RFA has been modified to correct and clarify a budgetary issue. The modification is underlined and in **Red Text**.

---

**Please Note:** As of 12/15/08, page 3 of this RFA has been modified to provide public notification of the availability of a set of Frequently Asked Questions. This modification is underlined and in **Red Text**.

---

**APPLICATION DEADLINE: January 6, 2009**



**U.S. Department of Agriculture**



**Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service**

**COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE;  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**EXTENSION INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COORDINATION AND  
SUPPORT PROGRAMS**

**INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

**CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE:** This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under **10.500**.

**DATES:** Applications must be received by close of business (COB) on **January 6, 2009 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding. Comments regarding this request for applications (RFA) are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**STAKEHOLDER INPUT:** The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) is requesting comments regarding this RFA from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next RFA for the program, if applicable, and will be used to meet the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(c)(2)). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current RFA from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education, and extension for use in formulating future RFAs for competitive programs. Written stakeholder comments on this RFA should be submitted in accordance with the deadline set forth in the DATES portion of this notice, above.

Written stakeholder comments should be submitted by mail to: Policy and Oversight Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: [RFP-OEP@csrees.usda.gov](mailto:RFP-OEP@csrees.usda.gov). (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program RFA.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:** CSREES requests applications for the Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (EIPM-CS) for fiscal year (FY) 2009. This program contains two components, the EIPM-CS Coordination Program and the EIPM-CS Support Program. Both programs support state and local contributions in advancing the goals of the National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) ([www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf](http://www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf)) by addressing priority needs associated with the coordination, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of Extension IPM programs. Through training, EIPM-CS funds help pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices. All EIPM-CS efforts are intended to contribute to the achievement of National IPM goals through the demonstration and evaluation of IPM practices in production agriculture and other settings. Support will be provided for programs that strengthen the ability

of CSREES and its IPM partner institutions to actively address local, state, and National IPM needs delivered through the Cooperative Extension Services and rapidly respond to new issues and opportunities.

Successful proposals will demonstrate effective implementation of IPM to end users and extension educators. The amount anticipated to be made available for EIPM-CS in FY 2009 is approximately \$8.5 million. It is anticipated that approximately \$8.1 million will be awarded for EIPM-CS Coordination programs and up to \$300,000 will be awarded for EIPM-CS Support projects.

This notice identifies the objectives for EIPM-CS proposals, the eligibility criteria for programs and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for an EIPM-CS grant. CSREES additionally requests stakeholder input from any interested party for use in the development of the next RFA for this program.

**A total of 3 conference calls were scheduled to accommodate the eligible applicants (two on November 25, 2008 and one on December 4, 2008) relating to the EIPM-CS RFA. A set of questions were asked by the conference call participants that have broad interest to applicants. The questions and answers appropriately clarifying the RFA are posted in a set of FAQ's.**

## Table of Contents

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION .....	5
A. Legislative Authority and Background.....	5
B. Purpose and Priorities .....	6
PART II—AWARD INFORMATION.....	15
A. Available Funding .....	15
B. Types of Applications.....	15
C. Program Components.....	15
PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION.....	17
A. Eligible Applicants .....	17
B. Cost Sharing or Matching .....	17
PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION .....	18
A. Electronic Application Package.....	18
B. Content and Form of Application Submission.....	19
C. Submission Dates and Times .....	21
D. Funding Restrictions.....	22
E. Other Submission Requirements.....	22
PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS .....	23
A. General.....	23
B. Evaluation Criteria.....	23
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality .....	27
D. Organizational Management Information .....	27
PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION .....	28
A. General.....	28
B. Award Notice .....	29
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements .....	29
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements .....	31
PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT .....	32
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION .....	33
A. Access to Review Information.....	33
B. Use of Funds; Changes .....	33
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards.....	34
D. Regulatory Information .....	34
E. Definitions.....	34
F. Electronic Application Checklist .....	38

## **PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION**

### **A. Legislative Authority and Background**

Section 7403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246) (FCEA) amended Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)) to provide the opportunity for 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia to compete for and receive these funds directly from the Secretary of Agriculture. EIPM – CS is among the Extension programs funded under this authority.

#### **Background – Stakeholder Input**

On October 6, 2008, CSREES held a stakeholder listening session on Smith-Lever 3(d) IPM restructuring due to changes found in Section 7403 of the FCEA

(see [http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/reporting/stakeholder/eipm\\_stakeholder.html](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/reporting/stakeholder/eipm_stakeholder.html)).

Changes to Smith-Lever 3(d) funding include: (1) the requirement for a competitive program delivery model as opposed to a long-standing formula delivery model; and (2) the inclusion of 1890 Institutions and the University of the District of Columbia as eligible entities to receive 3(d) funds. The primary intent of the listening session was to gather stakeholder input on program focus and design. Prior to the listening session, National Program Leaders presented stakeholders with the following questions:

1. What should be the primary goals and objectives of the program?
2. How can CSREES funding be optimized?
3. Should there be a limit on the number of proposals that can be submitted by each eligible institution?
4. What criteria should be used in the proposal review and selection process?
5. Should regional, multi-institutional or multi-state proposals be encouraged?
6. Should proposals addressing gaps in current program coverage (organic, small farms, etc.) be given greater emphasis in the evaluative process?
7. What limits should be set on funding and project duration?

The written comment period ran from October 6 through November 15, 2008. Over 400 written comments were received. A written summary of the comments is available at [http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/reporting/stakeholder/eipm\\_stakeholder.html](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/reporting/stakeholder/eipm_stakeholder.html). Contained in the comments are many areas with broad agreement among stakeholders. For instance, from both verbal and written comments, it is clear that stakeholders feel the most critical issue is making the fiscal year 2009 funds available as soon as possible, which the Agency is responding to by promptly issuing this RFA and proceeding with the competition on an aggressive schedule. Stakeholder comments on questions 5 and 6 above, however, diverged and deserve separate treatment.

In response to Question 5, we received input on the way multi-institutional or multi-state is defined, as well as whether these types of proposals should be encouraged. Many stakeholders felt that these proposals should be a secondary concern of the EIPM-CS. In this RFA, the majority of the funds are available for what are termed programs, rather than projects. Use of this term is not accidental. It highlights the continuing emphasis on state support, a primary element of the IPM success story. In order to assure that IPM is a component of Cooperative Extension programs at as many eligible institutions as possible; CSREES is limiting submissions to one Coordination proposal per institution. EIPM-CS is designed to foster collaboration, not competition, among IPM programs. Institutions are encouraged to work together in the development and maintenance of a network of Extension IPM programs to accelerate the technology transfer for IPM, reduce duplication of efforts, maximize program potential and ensure that information is disseminated. Applications that propose a limited or extended network of multi-institutional or multi-state collaborations are encouraged in an effort to provide maximum coverage and benefit of Extension IPM.

In response to Question 6, some stakeholders expressed the sentiment that support can be provided for issues such as organics and small farms by developing broad funding categories. Others suggested that there may be adequate local funding where support is needed for particular local needs. In this RFA, the Extension IPM program focuses on broad areas to address national priorities such as are defined in the National IPM Roadmap. Multi-disciplinary IPM Coordinators serve as the backbone for Extension IPM. This program retains the flexibility to fund stand alone or collaborative awards and also the flexibility in how funding can be used for local IPM Coordinators to respond to local needs. EIPM-CS is designed to develop the administrative infrastructure required to facilitate and expand Extension IPM programs. The long history of broad state and local Extension IPM will continue to contribute to National IPM progress. Additionally, CSREES encourages an increased membership of regional committees to include representatives of all eligible institutions competing for EIPM-CS funds.

Efforts have been made to incorporate suggestions into the EIPM-CS program as allowable by law. Stakeholder comments received after the close of the initial comment period, November 15, 2008, will be retained and incorporated into the next comment period, scheduled for Spring 2009.

## **B. Purpose and Priorities**

The primary elements of IPM since inception had been to provide:

- a focal point for IPM team building, communication and stakeholder participation;
- applied research and demonstration;
- development of predictive models and information management systems;
- preparation of manuals and fact sheets;
- training programs for agents, consultants, scouts, growers, others; and
- technical assistance and trouble shooting.

EIPM-CS funds help agricultural producers and other pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of

methods and strategies. These efforts will contribute to the achievement of National IPM goals. A strong CSREES/Land-Grant university partnership will enable EIPM – CS to address pest management challenges on an appropriate scale — from county level to multi-state production regions.

Each applicant will identify an IPM Coordinator(s) and propose program-level Extension IPM activities appropriate to needs identified by stakeholder advisory committees and commodity teams operating at the state and local levels. Proposals will describe how the requested program funds will be used for a range of state-based extension activities that support National IPM goals. The EIPM – CS is intended to assure that IPM is a component of Cooperative Extension programs at as many eligible institutions as possible. IPM has been promoted for many years, but there is an ongoing need to keep its varied and evolving practices in front of potential users to increase the likelihood of building sustainable pest management systems as stated in the National Roadmap for IPM (<http://www.ipmcenters.org/ipmroadmap.pdf>). The IPM Roadmap was developed by several federal agencies in collaboration with partners in the public and private sectors to provide a strategic plan for federal investment in IPM programs. This document has served as the guide for IPM implementation since May 2004.

The IPM Roadmap established the future direction for IPM within the context of:

1. Improving cost benefit analyses through the adoption of IPM practices.
2. Reducing potential human health risks from pests and related pest management practices.
3. Minimizing adverse environmental effects from pests and related pest management practices.

While the Roadmap identified three focus areas for IPM implementation (production agriculture, natural resources and recreational environments, and residential and public areas), the authors acknowledged that IPM is useful and desirable in other situations. This RFA uses broader areas of programming emphasis within the basic structure provided in the Roadmap. To simplify, the principles of IPM should assure that neither the pest nor the management practices for that pest detract from our quality of life. IPM is a multi-disciplinary approach that may encompass the management of arthropod pests, plant diseases, weeds in all environments and all pest related disciplines. All applicants to this program must recognize that this is a Cooperative Extension program and as such does not create knowledge through research, but disseminates knowledge to users beyond the traditional classroom.

**In the FY 2009 EIPM-CS RFA, CSREES announces two distinct components:**

1. **COORDINATION** proposals should be focused on the creation of a program of Extension IPM activities that address multiple emphasis areas described in Part I B (1) of this RFA – (See also Table on page 17.)
2. **SUPPORT** proposals should address a specific need identified in Part I B (2) of this RFA – (See also Table on page 17.)

**PLEASE NOTE: IN FY 2009, AN APPLICANT INSTITUTION IS LIMITED TO SUBMITTING ONLY ONE COORDINATION AND ONLY ONE SUPPORT APPLICATION.**

**1. *EIPM-CS COORDINATION PROGRAMS – Address Administrative and Basic Functions of Institutional Extension IPM Programs.***

In FY 2009, CSREES anticipates making up to 76 *COORDINATION* awards of varying funding levels to eligible institutions through the competitive EIPM – CS. *COORDINATION* awards may not exceed a 12-month project period. **IN FY 2009, NO MORE THAN ONE *EIPM-CS COORDINATION PROGRAM APPLICATION WILL BE ACCEPTED FROM EACH ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.* Each qualifying application must be accompanied by a letter of support from the Extension Director/Extension Administrator or be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Submissions from an institution without endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator will result in the application being excluded from review. Multiple applications from a single institution for *COORDINATION* activities will result in all applications from that institution being excluded from review.**

*COORDINATION* applications must request funding for comprehensive Extension IPM programs that address emphasis areas most suitable to the capacity and expertise of the Applicant Institution. Comprehensive proposals must describe a multi-disciplinary approach to Extension IPM that begins with the designation of an Extension IPM Coordinator(s) and include a description of their duties. IPM Coordinator duties might include:

- 1) Planning and coordinating Extension IPM outreach.
- 2) Responding to IPM-related inquiries from the Environmental Protection Agency and other governmental and non-governmental organizations.
- 3) Coordinating and reporting on state/institutional IPM activities across disciplinary boundaries.
- 4) Supporting county-level capacity in IPM and developing new stand-alone, supplemental and collaborative IPM efforts.
- 5) Fulfilling program management and team building functions.
- 6) Participating in networking activities such as regional or multi-state committees.
- 7) Representing your institution at IPM multi-state committees.
- 8) Reporting to regional, national, or international meetings on program activities, progress, and outcomes.

Building a proposal will then require adding emphasis areas most suited to the capacity of the institution to address identified stakeholder needs. Funding amounts requested should appropriately reflect the scope or scale of the activities proposed for each emphasis area addressed. All *COORDINATION* applications must describe the extent and ability of the proposing institution to conduct the Extension IPM activities for each emphasis area requested for funding. These emphasis areas carry equal value in the ranking of an application during the peer review process. Additional funding may be requested for IPM Collaborations (see Part I (B) (1) (b))



**All EIPM – CS Coordination applications must include support for the Extension IPM Coordination (as described in a. below) and address a minimum of two and a maximum of six of the ten emphasis areas listed below:**

1. IPM in Agronomic Crops
2. IPM in High Value/High Input/or Intensively Managed Crops
3. IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships
4. IPM Support for Pest Diagnostic Facilities
5. IPM in Schools
6. IPM in Housing
7. IPM on Recreational Lands
8. Consumer/Urban IPM
9. IPM for Pests of Humans and Vectors of Diseases
10. IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems

Proposals must describe stakeholders who will be served, type of program coordination and activities proposed, economic and social impact of proposed activities, level of collaboration and partnership with stakeholders, etc. Proposals should reflect the principles of IPM described in the National Roadmap for IPM (<http://www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadmap.pdf>) and offer appropriate solutions to pest issues through the delivery of education and coordination of programs directed to end users (e.g., producers, homeowners and IPM practitioners). All emphasis areas within a program **MUST** contain an evaluation function, identifying changes in knowledge, behavior and condition or culture.

**a. IPM Coordination: (Required in all *COORDINATION* Applications)**

IPM coordination at each funded institution includes the foundational functions of IPM coordination. Coordination responsibilities may be assigned to one person or may be distributed among two or more individuals. **The proposal must identify the individual(s) who will have administrative and programmatic responsibilities for the proposed Extension IPM program. The programmatic lead must be identified as an IPM Coordinator for the institution.** The Program Director (PD) may be the IPM Coordinator, but that individual is not required to assume that role. If selected for funding, the individuals designated in this section are jointly responsible for overall leadership of IPM Extension education programs at the institution to ensure that IPM efforts are coordinated with other relevant programs. *Each applicant may apply for up to \$25,000 for this coordination function. All funded programs must include support for the IPM Coordination component. This component will be assessed on a five point scale for merit, which will include quality, relevancy, responsiveness, and potential for success and impact. Failure of this component to sufficiently represent program quality, relevancy, responsiveness, and potential for success and impact of this component will place the proposal in the 'do not fund' category.*

**b. IPM Collaboration: (not required in *COORDINATION* applications, but encouraged)**

EIPM-CS encourages collaboration among institutions with common program elements. Logical advantages may be realized by coordinating efforts with multiple institutional programs to achieve synergy in program outcomes by crossing geographical or political boundaries within agroecosystems/ecozones or within areas where similar production practices or pest problems may prevail. IPM Collaborations are desirable as a means of minimizing duplication of effort and providing continuity across geographic areas with common problems, production practices or pest management practices. These collaborations may also be multi-state, if common program elements exist and the collaboration contributes to the goals of EIPM-CS. A single application may detail several collaborations with various IPM Partners; however, *funding requests may not exceed a maximum of \$25,000 per application. **The applicant institution may request no more than the maximum of \$25,000 on their submitted budget for the collaborations they host and coordinate.*** Logical collaborations exist where:

- (1) An applicant institution includes a cooperative element with at least one other entity not legally affiliated with the applicant institution; and
- (2) Where the applicant institution and each cooperating entity will assume a significant role in the implementation of a proposed program.

Funds need not be subcontracted in all cases, and may be administered by the applicant institution. Only the applicant institution must meet the definition of an eligible institution as specified in this RFA.

Collaboration components are not required in all proposals, but may strengthen Extension IPM programs where logical partnerships occur. Programs are encouraged to develop emphasis areas that include partnerships among academic institutions, appropriate agencies, or organizations to more efficiently deliver coordinated Extension IPM programs to clientele, reducing duplication of effort and costs or creating program efficiencies. Applications should explain how the project will maximize partnership and collaborative efforts to strengthen IPM programs in specific areas (e.g., involvement of specialists in related or complementary disciplines in joint projects or cooperative activities with other institutions or organizations). Also explain how the activities will stimulate academia, the States, or the private sector to join with the Federal partner in enhancing food and agricultural education. Provide evidence, via letters from the parties proposed to be involved in the IPM partnership or collaborative arrangement (see instructions in Part IV(B)(2)(c)). Collaborative activities may include joint planning or coordination meetings and joint efforts to implement programs involving program staff from multiple participating institutions, such as workshops, grower programs, demonstrations, and other program activities. Beneficial IPM partnerships may involve entities outside the university community such as city or county public health services, tribal entities, Federal service agencies and non-governmental organizations.

IPM Collaborations are intended to link programs across institutions to strengthen impacts of funding awarded for other EIPM – CS emphasis areas and potential funding sources. Requests for funding for proposed collaborations **SHOULD ONLY APPEAR** in host institutions' applications; however, all collaborators should describe their proposed role in their plans of Extension activities. Host applications must include letters of collaboration from all participating institutions (see instructions for attachment in Part IV(B)(2)(c)). Sub-contractors must include a confirmation of the collaboration from the host institution. Letters of collaboration must detail the responsibilities of each participant.

c. **Areas of Programming Emphasis** – *Each individual emphasis area present in the proposal will be assessed on a five-point scale for merit, which will include quality, relevancy, and responsiveness, and potential for success and impact.* A minimum of two and a maximum of six of the following emphasis areas are required in all *COORDINATION* applications.

1. **IPM in Agronomic Crops** – To include grain and oilseed crops such as wheat, corn, soybean, rice and other crops traditionally viewed as agronomic. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$125,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the economic significance of the crop and the need for IPM in the crop as defined by statewide receipts, acres planted, the potential for addressing environmental or health risks, stakeholder input and/or the importance of the pest in a local cropping system.
2. **IPM in High Value, High Input or Intensively Managed Crops** – To include cotton, potatoes, fruits, vegetables or other specialty crops (including nursery and greenhouse production) where input costs, intensiveness of production or return on investment are greater than with grain or oilseed crops. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$300,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the economic significance of the crop and the need for IPM in the crop as defined by statewide receipts, acres planted, the potential for addressing environmental or health risks, stakeholder input and/or the importance of the pest in a local cropping system.
3. **IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships** – Includes coordination with local NRCS districts or State Conservationists to implement the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 595 standard for pest management (<ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NHQ/practice-standards/standards/595.pdf>). *The 595 standard for pest management practice is applied as part of a conservation system to mitigate the negative impacts on soil, water air, plant, and animal and/or human resources and to protect and enhance quantity and quality of agricultural outputs.* Applicants must show evidence of collaboration with their NRCS State Conservationist or local conservation districts. Budget must reflect level of collaboration. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the significance of the issue and the potential of successful coordination with NRCS and local conservation districts.
4. **IPM Support for Pest Diagnostic Facilities** – Proper pest diagnostics is fundamental to the application of appropriate pest management practices. The foundation of pest management is clear identification of the pest or problem. Stakeholder input provided to CSREES acknowledges the critical nature of IPM support for such diagnostic facilities. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the defined need and existing support for diagnostic facilities.

5. **IPM in Schools** – Extension training, outreach programs and materials development to increase adoption of IPM practices in schools to address childhood exposure to pest related allergens and pesticide residues in the PreK-12 school environment. Additionally, activities in this section may include development and/or delivery of Extension IPM education programs. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the number of school districts to be served, need for IPM in the educational environment or demonstrated need for pest management in the district served.
6. **IPM in Housing** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices in housing to address resident exposure to pest-related allergens and pesticide residues. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the number of housing units to be served and the need for IPM in the facilities. Programs may target public and/or reservation housing or other forms of housing and collaborate with county social services and other entities that make housing affordable and accessible, such as Habitat for Humanity.
7. **IPM on Recreational Lands** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices in parks, athletic facilities, golf courses, natural areas, parklands and other recreational areas. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Partnerships should be cultivated with federal and state agencies that manage public lands.
8. **Consumer/Urban IPM** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices by private citizens in the home landscape, lawn care companies, garden centers, urban foresters and similar practitioners and applications. [Note: Programming for nursery and greenhouse production should be included in the emphasis area #2 “IPM in High Value, High Input or Intensively Managed Crops”, listed above.] Significant linkages with state and/or county Extension Master Gardener programs are strongly encouraged. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the local risk from the pests described in the proposal, the level of service provided to the public, and the economic significance of the pest to consumer horticulture.
9. **IPM for Pests of Humans and Vectors of Disease** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices for management of ticks and lice, mosquitoes and similar pests of humans, particularly those that may vector disease. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the local risk from the described pests. Risks from pests of humans are highly regional. Evidence of incidence of disease or frequency of pest incidence in a locale are valid justifications for importance of a local pest problem. Partnerships

may involve for example: entities outside the university community such as city or county public health services, Federal service agencies and non-governmental entities. However, these non-Land-Grant IPM partners may not originate a proposal. Indoor pests such as bedbugs should be addressed under emphasis area #6 “IPM in Housing”, above.

#### **10. IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems –**

Participation in pest monitoring that is associated with wide area tracking such as through the integrated pest management Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education (ipmPIPE) is encouraged. Tracking and monitoring efforts require implementation of standardized national protocols for ipmPIPE. Preparation of training and extension education materials within those systems may be a component of this program area. The ipmPIPE provides a delivery model for the development of lected tools to increase usefulness, improve data retrieval and interpretation and maintain databases and other information resources needed for pest management decision making. Detailed information about ipmPIPE can be found at <http://www.ipmpipe.org/>. **Each applicant may apply for up to \$50,000 for this program emphasis area.** Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on costs to conduct the proposed activities associated with the monitoring program and how the funds will complement funding from other sources.

## **2. EIPM-CS SUPPORT PROJECTS – Address Critical Regional or National IPM Extension Program Needs**

In FY 2009, *SUPPORT* projects within EIPM – CS will advance the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM ([www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf](http://www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf)) by supporting projects to address the significant overarching issues of:

- a. Extension IPM Impact Evaluation; and**
- b. Extension Development for Critical IPM Issues.**

These two efforts will support and strengthen the likelihood of National IPM goals being reached by enabling collaboration and enhancing the ability of the PDs to report mission critical impacts across institutional boundaries. *In FY 2009, no more than one EIPM-CS SUPPORT application will be accepted from each eligible institution.* In FY 2009 CSREES anticipates making one IPM Impact Evaluation award and up to two Critical IPM Issues awards.

*SUPPORT* proposals submitted under EIPM – CS should be relevant to **program evaluation and impact assessment** on a National scale OR to **extension development for critical IPM issues**. Each qualifying application must be accompanied by a letter of support from the Extension Director/Extension Administrator or be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Other submissions from an institution without endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator will be excluded from review. If multiple applications are received from an institution with endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator for support activities, all applications from that institution will be excluded from review.

Applicant institutions to the EIPM-CS Support program may apply to **either, but not both**, of the following two project types:

**a. Extension IPM Impact Evaluation:** Impact assessment and the identification and reporting of outcomes has become a requirement throughout government. The ability of biological scientists to develop social science tools to measure adoption of IPM is a challenge. The successful applicant to this program will lead evaluation efforts or guide an evaluation training and development team as follows.

IPM Impact Evaluation applicants must:

1. Lead or co-lead efforts of the National Extension IPM Evaluation Group (NIPMEG - <http://www.ipm.gov/NIPMEG/index.cfm>).
2. Lead post-award impact assessment and documentation of Extension IPM impacts that can be aggregated to the multi-state/regional or national scale.
3. Lead the development of products that demonstrate national or multi-regional progress on one or more goals described in the National Roadmap for IPM.
4. Develop and support tools to enable impact reporting.
5. Assist with improving evaluation efforts across the country and identifying strong programs with reportable outcomes or the potential for reportable outcomes.
6. Assist with post-award impact assessment and documentation of project impacts at the broad community level.
7. Assist in assuring evaluation through documentation of impacts on behavior change or condition.
8. Provide an appropriate management plan for the project team and all IPM Partners.

Proposed IPM Impact Evaluation applications may address any of a variety of projects and activities, including, but not limited to:

- IPM program assessment and evaluation,
- The development of case studies,
- Impact reports and outreach materials that highlight successful IPM programs.

All applications must include a budget for each year of the proposed project in the application.

**Applications may request up to \$200,000 for up to a three-year project period.**

**b. EXTENSION DEVELOPMENT FOR CRITICAL IPM ISSUES:** High consequence and threatening pests and diseases are posing an increasing risk to American agriculture. Citrus Health issues (CTV/Brown Citrus Aphid, HLB/Asian Citrus Psyllid, etc.) and the Ug99 race of the Wheat Stem Rust pathogen are recognized as emerging issues and as such are eligible for funding in FY 2009 RFA. Projects that develop extension education materials and/or demonstration and applied research targeted at an extension audience are encouraged.

Extension IPM applications on critical issues should prepare producers for introduction of the pests of high consequence or management of these pests and stakeholder education. **Up to \$100,000 will be awarded with a maximum project period of one year.**

## **PART II—AWARD INFORMATION**

### **A. Available Funding**

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular application or to make a specific number of awards. It is anticipated that approximately \$8.5 million will be available to fund applications in FY 2009. Of that, it is anticipated that approximately \$8.1 million will be awarded for EIPM-CS Coordination programs and up to \$300,000 will be awarded for EIPM-CS Support projects.

### **B. Types of Applications**

In FY 2009, only new applications may be submitted to the EIPM-CS. New applications will be reviewed competitively using the selection process and evaluation criteria described in Part V—Application Review Requirements.

Awards will be made as standard grants which are instruments by which CSREES agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period without any statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date.

In future years or under certain circumstances, CSREES may determine that it will support continuation awards. CSREES is under no obligation to award a continuation grant and should CSREES decide to make such an award, the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) must make an affirmative decision to do so. A continuation grant is an instrument by which CSREES agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period with a statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date, provided that performance has been satisfactory, funds are available for this purpose, and continued support would be in the best interest of the Federal government and the public

### **C. Program Components**

#### **1. EIPM – CS *COORDINATION* program funding –**

- It is anticipated that approximately 76 programs may be funded for a maximum of \$650,000 per award. The project period for FY 2009 is one year.

#### **2. EIPM – CS *SUPPORT* program funding –**

- **Impact Evaluation Project** – It is anticipated that one project will be funded for up to \$200,000. The project period for FY 2009 is up to three years.
- **Extension Development for Critical IPM Issues** – It is anticipated that a maximum of two projects will be funded with up to \$100,000 total allocated (one project per topic area). The project period for FY 2009 is one year.

## EIPM – CS Funding Table

### EIPM-CS Coordination Program

Each institution may submit only one *COORDINATION* Program proposal. The proposal must include support for IPM Coordination and a minimum of two and a maximum of six Emphasis Areas. Maximum project period is 1 year:

	Components and Emphasis Areas	Funding Cap
Required Component	IPM Coordination	\$ 25,000
Encouraged Component	IPM Collaboration	\$ 25,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM in Agronomic Crops	\$ 125,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM in High Value/High Input or Intensively Managed Crops	\$ 300,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM Support for Pest Diagnostic Facilities	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM in Schools	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM in Housing	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM on Recreational Lands	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	Consumer/Urban IPM	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM for Pests of Humans and Vectors of Diseases	\$ 50,000
Optional Emphasis Area	IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems	\$ 50,000

### EIPM-CS Support Program

Each institution may submit only one *SUPPORT* Program proposal:

	Funding Cap
Extension IPM Impact Evaluation: Maximum Project Period is 3 Years	\$ 200,000
Extension Development for Critical IPM Issues: Maximum Project Period is 1 year	\$ 100,000



## **PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION**

### **A. Eligible Applicants**

Only 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Universities and Colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia are eligible to apply.

Award recipients may subcontract to organizations not eligible to apply provided such organizations are necessary for the conduct of the project. An applicant's failure to meet an eligibility criterion by the time of an application deadline will result in CSREES not accepting the application, or even though an application may be reviewed, will preclude CSREES from making an award.

### **B. Cost Sharing or Matching**

There is no matching requirement for EIPM – CS applications and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

## PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

### A. Electronic Application Package

Only electronic applications may be submitted via Grants.gov to CSREES in response to this RFA.

Prior to preparing an application, it is suggested that the PD/PI first contact an Authorized Representative (AR) (also referred to as Authorized Organizational Representative or AOR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit electronic applications through Grants.gov. If the organization is not prepared, the AR should see [http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get\\_registered.jsp](http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp) for steps for preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.

The steps to access application materials are as follows:

1. Download and install PureEdge Viewer, a small, free program that provides access to the grant application. See [http://www.grants.gov/resources/download\\_software.jsp#pureedge](http://www.grants.gov/resources/download_software.jsp#pureedge).
2. The application package must be obtained via Grants.gov, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, click on “Apply for Grants” in the left-hand column, click on “**Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Instructions**,” enter the funding opportunity number **USDA-CSREES-SLBCD-001907** in the appropriate box and click “Download Package.” From the search results, click “Download” to access the application package.

Contained within the application package is the “[CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov](#).” This Guide contains an introduction and general Grants.gov instructions, information about how to use a Grant Application Package in Grants.gov, and instructions on how to complete the application forms.

**If assistance is needed to access the application package** (e.g., downloading or navigating PureEdge forms, using PureEdge with a Macintosh computer), refer to resources available on the Grants.gov Web site first (<http://grants.gov/>). Grants.gov assistance is also available as follows:

- Grants.gov customer support  
Toll Free: 1-800-518-4726  
Business Hours: Monday through Friday 7:00 am – 9:00 pm Eastern Standard Time  
Email: [support@grants.gov](mailto:support@grants.gov)

See <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html> for additional resources for applying electronically.

## B. Content and Form of Application Submission

Electronic applications should be prepared following instructions in Part V and VI of the document entitled “[A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov](#).” This guide is part of the corresponding application package (see Section A. of this Part). The following is **additional information** needed in order to prepare an application in response to this RFA. If there is discrepancy between the two documents, the information contained in this RFA is overriding.

**Note the attachment requirements (e.g., portable document format) in Part III section 3. of the Guide. ANY PROPOSALS CONTAINING NON-PDF DOCUMENTS WILL BE AT RISK OF BEING EXCLUDED FROM CSREES REVIEW. Partial applications will be excluded from CSREES review. With documented prior approval, resubmitted applications will be accepted until close of business on the closing date in the RFA.**

**If you do not own PDF-generating software, Grants.gov provides online tools to assist applicants. Users will find a link to “Convert Documents to PDF” on <http://grants.gov/assets/PDFConversion.pdf>.**

### **1. SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet**

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 2. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

### **2. R&R Other Project Information Form**

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 3. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

**a. Field 6 - Project Summary/Abstract.** The Project Summary may not exceed **250 words** on one page, and should clearly indicate the appropriate EIPM-CS program (*COORDINATION* or *SUPPORT*). For EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* program proposals, please list the collaborations with eligible entities as well as the *emphasis areas* included in the proposal. For EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* program proposals, please include the project type proposed. The summary should also include the relevance of the project to the goals of EIPM-CS. The importance of a concise, informative Project Summary cannot be overemphasized.

**b. Field 7 - Project Narrative.** PLEASE NOTE: the Project Narrative section may not exceed a total of 20 single- or double-spaced pages, including figures and tables. The Introduction may not exceed 5 pages, and the rest of the Project Narrative may not exceed 15 pages. These EIPM-CS page limitations apply regardless of whether figures or tables are included. All pages, including those with figures and tables, should be numbered sequentially. Applications exceeding the applicable page limitation will be at risk of being excluded from review. This word and page limitation applies regardless of

whether figures or tables are included. These maximums have been established to ensure fair and equitable competition.

**The Project Narrative must include all of the following:**

(i) Introduction.

Include the following list of:

1. Program Staff – include name, title, affiliation, address, and e-mail for PD(s), CoPD(s) and Key Personnel. For COORDINATION applications: the IPM Coordinator(s) and administrative contact(s) must be identified.
2. A clear statement of the goal(s) and critical need(s) of IPM being addressed and supporting Extension outreach objectives.
3. Description of how stakeholders will be engaged in setting Extension IPM program direction on an on-going basis.
4. Summary of the body of knowledge or other past activities that substantiate the need for the proposed project/program.
5. Description of ongoing or recently completed significant activities related to the proposed project/program including the work of key project/program personnel. Applications should also demonstrate how duplication of effort with similar activities by others will be avoided.
6. Preliminary data/information pertinent to the proposed work should be included in this section. All works cited should be referenced and attached at Field 8 of this Form, Bibliography & Reference Cited. Refer to Part V, 3.8 of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

(ii) Rationale and Significance. Concisely present the rationale behind the proposed extension activities. The specific relationship of the project/program's objectives to one or more of the EIPM – CS emphasis areas should be shown clearly. These purposes and focus emphasis areas are described under Part I, B, Purpose and Priorities.

(iii) Approach. For each component of requested funding in the Coordination program proposal (e.g., IPM Coordination, IPM Collaboration, and at least two and no more than six of the ten emphasis areas) clearly state the activities proposed or problems being addressed and clearly describe the approaches being applied. Support program proposals should also provide sufficient detail to describe proposed activities. A logic model is suggested as a good planning and evaluation tool (see [http://www.csrees.usda.gov/about/strat\\_plan\\_logic\\_models.html](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/about/strat_plan_logic_models.html) for more information). Specifically, this section must include:

1. A description of the activities proposed, key personnel or institution roles in those activities, and the sequence in which the activities are to be performed;
2. Outputs and expected deliverables to be developed for the program;
3. Expected outcomes, including how the project/program expects to address overarching goals of the National Roadmap for IPM: profitability, reduced environmental impact, and fewer impacts of pests and pest management on human health;
4. How results or products will be used;
5. Means by which results will be assessed or evaluated; and

6. Pitfalls that may be encountered.

**c. Field 11 - Other Attachments – PDF**

**Appendices to Project Description.** Appendices to the Project Description are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project/program. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the text and/or figures and tables page limitations. For COORDINATION program proposals please include a PDF attachment listing collaborations with eligible institutions, supporting documentation and a description of the roles to be performed by each institution. If IPM Collaboration funds are being requested, letters of collaboration **must** be included as part of the application.

**3. R&R Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded)**

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 4. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

**4. R&R Personal Data** – As noted in Part V, 5. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide, the submission of this information is voluntary and is not a precondition of award. If completing the information, **do not enter any data in the field requesting the social security number.**

**5. R&R Budget**

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 6. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide. Travel costs to report outcomes at regional, national or international meetings are allowable in the budget.

**6. Supplemental Information Form**

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part VI, 1. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

**a. Field 2. Program Code.** Enter the program code name “Extension Integrated Pest Management – Coordination and Support Program” and the program code “**QQIPM**” if applying for *COORDINATION* proposals or “**QQ.E**” if applying for *SUPPORT* proposals.

**b. Field 8. Conflict of Interest List.** A conflict of interest list IS required under this program.

**C. Submission Dates and Times**

**Instructions for submitting an application are included in Part IV, Section 1.9 of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.**

Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on Tuesday, **January 6, 2009 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

Correspondence regarding submitted applications will be sent using e-mail. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide accurate e-mail addresses, where designated, on the SF-424 R&R Application for Federal Assistance.

If the Authorized Representative (AR) has not received correspondence **from CSREES** regarding a submitted application within seven days of submission of the application, please contact the Program Contact identified in Part VII of the applicable RFA and request the proposal number assigned to the application. **Failure to do so may result in the application not being considered for funding by the peer review panel. Once the application has been assigned a proposal number, this number should be cited on all future correspondence.**

#### **D. Funding Restrictions**

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs are unallowable costs under this program, and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of an institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

In addition, tuition remission is prohibited by Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3319).

CSREES has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities.

#### **E. Other Submission Requirements**

The applicant should follow the submission requirements noted in the document entitled "A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES Applications via Grants.gov."

## **PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS**

### **A. General**

Each application will be evaluated in a two-part process. First, each application will be screened to ensure that it meets the administrative requirements as set forth in this RFA. Second, applications that meet these requirements will be technically evaluated by a review panel.

Reviewers will be selected based upon training and experience in relevant scientific, extension, or education fields, taking into account the following factors: (a) The level of relevant formal scientific, technical education, or extension experience of the individual, as well as the extent to which an individual is engaged in relevant research, education, or extension activities; (b) the need to include as reviewers experts from various areas of specialization within relevant scientific, education, or extension fields; (c) the need to include as reviewers other experts (e.g., producers, range or forest managers/operators, and consumers) who can assess relevance of the applications to targeted audiences and to program needs; (d) the need to include as reviewers experts from a variety of organizational types (e.g., colleges, universities, industry, state and Federal agencies, private profit and non-profit organizations) and geographic locations; (e) the need to maintain a balanced composition of reviewers with regard to minority and female representation and an equitable age distribution; and (f) the need to include reviewers who can judge the effective usefulness to producers and the general public of each application.

### **B. Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation criteria below will be used by the Peer Review panel in reviewing applications submitted in response to this RFA:

---

#### **Criteria for EIPM – CS: *COORDINATION* Program Proposals**

##### **1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):**

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM. The proposal should address national, regional or locally relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (10 points);
- (b) Clearly defined plans to involve stakeholders. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in defining the program and how their input will be solicited and incorporated (10 points);
- (c) Quality of Extension outreach plan. Application describes a detailed outreach plan that includes program benefits and how impacts will be measured, including the likelihood that the program will provide solutions that lead to measurable benefits to producers and consumers (10 points);
- (d) Demonstrated understanding of IPM in emphasis areas addressed (10 points); and

- (e) Documentation that the program applies a trans-disciplinary approach to address economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM (10 points).

## **2. Proposal Quality (50 points):**

- (a) Conceptual adequacy – Application clearly states objectives that are potentially attainable within program time, scope and budget (10 points);
- (b) Design – The application’s methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to program objectives (10 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise, including quality of collaborations. (10 points);
- (d) Experience of Senior/Key project/program personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points);
- (f) Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA (10 points); and

### **Determining Awards for the Highest Ranking *COORDINATION* Proposals:**

Stakeholder input suggested funding as many programs as possible in order to ensure the success of a national IPM network. The Peer Review Panel will evaluate the quality of each specific emphasis area applied for and the appropriateness of requested budgets to address the proposed plan of EIPM-CS activities. The panel will use this additional level of review to recommend funding levels and ensure the most efficient use of funds.

For the proposals ranked high enough to be considered for funding, the panel will evaluate the following:

- (a) Each required component (e.g. IPM Coordination, and from 2 to 6 emphasis areas) addressed will be ranked on a 0-5 scale as defined under proposal quality.
- (b) Proposal components earning 0 or 1 will be rated “do not fund”.
- (c) If the IPM Coordination component is rated 0 or 1, the entire proposal will be rated “do not fund”.
- (d) Budgets will be assessed for appropriateness based on planned activities and justification provided for each funded component including IPM Coordinator(s), IPM Collaborations, and each emphasis area included in the proposed budget. A 1-10 scale will be used to rank appropriateness and that guidance will be considered prior to the Agency requesting adjusted final budgets.



---

## Criteria for EIPM – CS: *SUPPORT* Program proposals

### 1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the project/program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM. The proposal should address relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (5 points).
- (b) Clearly demonstrates the institution's ability to fulfill the proposed activities (5 points);
- (c) Stakeholder involvement. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in the project/program and how their input will be solicited and incorporated (10 points);
- (d) Extension outreach plan. Application includes a detailed outreach plan that includes project benefits and a description of how impacts will be measured, including the likelihood that the project/program will provide solutions that lead to measurable benefits to producers and consumers, and will facilitate information dissemination. Value of plan to evaluate how well the information technology need is being met (10 points);
- (e) Demonstrated understanding of evaluation or emerging pest systems within the greater IPM system concept (10 points); and
- (f) Documented trans-disciplinary approach that addresses economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM. Proposal addresses appropriateness to all applicable pest groups and disciplines (10 points).

### 2. Proposal Quality (50 points):

- (a) Conceptual adequacy – Application clearly states objectives that are potentially attainable within project/program time, scope and budget (10 points);
- (b) Design – The application's methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to project/program objectives (15 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise (5 points);
- (d) Experience of Senior/Key project personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points);

- (f)** Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the project/program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA (5 points); and
- (g)** Adherence to RFA guidelines (5 points).

### **C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality**

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher Education Publications, Inc., 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 648, Falls Church, Virginia 22042. Phone: (703) 532-2300. Web site: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

Names of submitting institutions and individuals, as well as application content and peer evaluations, will be kept confidential, except to those involved in the review process, to the extent permitted by law. In addition, the identities of peer reviewers will remain confidential throughout the entire review process. Therefore, the names of the reviewers will not be released to applicants.

### **D. Organizational Management Information**

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one time basis, with updates on an as needed basis, as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another CSREES program. CSREES will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the pre-award process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on its status as one of these entities, there are factors which may exclude an applicant from receiving Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

## **PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION**

### **A. General**

Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the awarding official of CSREES shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of CSREES as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so that project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by CSREES under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR).

Pre-Award costs may be approved for successful applicants in accordance with the CSREES Terms and Conditions. For more information about CSREES Award Terms and Conditions: <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html>

## **B. Award Notice**

The award document will provide pertinent instructions and information including, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) Legal name and address of performing organization or institution to whom the Administrator has issued an award under the terms of this request for applications;
- (2) Title of project;
- (3) Name(s) and institution(s) of PDs chosen to direct and control approved activities;
- (4) Identifying award number assigned by the Department;
- (5) Project period, specifying the amount of time the Department intends to support the project without requiring recompetition for funds;
- (6) Total amount of Departmental financial assistance approved by the Administrator during the project period;
- (7) Legal authority(ies) under which the award is issued;
- (8) Appropriate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number;
- (9) Applicable award terms and conditions (see <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html> to view CSREES award terms and conditions);
- (10) Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the award; and
- (11) Other information or provisions deemed necessary by CSREES to carry out its respective awarding activities or to accomplish the purpose of a particular award.

## **C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements**

Several Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant applications considered for review and to project grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

2 CFR Part 215—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 1, subpart A—USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

7 CFR Part 3—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-129 regarding debt collection.

7 CFR Part 15, subpart A—USDA implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

7 CFR Part 331 and 9 CFR Part 121—USDA implementation of the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002.

7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21 and A-122, now codified at 2 CFR Parts 220 and 230) and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and 7 CFR Part 3021—Governmentwide Requirements for Drug Free Workplace (Grants).

7 CFR Part 3018—USDA implementation of Restrictions on Lobbying. Imposes prohibitions and requirements for disclosure and certification related to lobbying on recipients of Federal contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and loans.

7 CFR Part 3052—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non profit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 3407—CSREES procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

7 CFR Part 3430 – CSREES Competitive and Noncompetitive Nonformula Grant Programs—General Grant Administrative Provisions.

29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973) and 7 CFR Part 15b (USDA implementation of statute) —prohibiting discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap in Federally assisted programs.

35 U.S.C. 200 et seq. —Bayh Dole Act, controlling allocation of rights to inventions made by employees of small business firms and domestic nonprofit organizations, including universities, in Federally assisted programs (implementing regulations are contained in 37 CFR Part 401).

#### **D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements**

Grantees are required to submit initial project information and annual and summary reports to CSREES' Current Research Information System (CRIS). The CRIS database contains narrative project information, progress/impact statements, and final technical reports that are made available to the public. For applications recommended for funding, instructions on preparation and submission of project documentation will be provided to the applicant by the agency contact. Documentation must be submitted to CRIS before CSREES funds will be released. Project reports will be requested by the CRIS office when required. For more information about CRIS, visit <http://cris.csrees.usda.gov>.

## **PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT**

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact Dr. Martin Draper; National Program Leader for Plant Pathology; Plant and Animal Systems Unit; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2220; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2220; telephone: (202) 401-1990; fax: (202) 401-4888; e-mail: [mdraper@csrees.usda.gov](mailto:mdraper@csrees.usda.gov).



## **PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION**

### **A. Access to Review Information**

Copies of reviews, not including the identity of reviewers, and a summary of the panel comments will be sent to the applicant PD after the review process has been completed.

### **B. Use of Funds; Changes**

#### **1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility**

Unless the terms and conditions of the award state otherwise, the awardee may not in whole or in part delegate or transfer to another person, institution, or organization the responsibility for use or expenditure of award funds.

#### **2. Changes in Project Plans**

a. The permissible changes by the awardee, PD(s), or other key project personnel in the approved project shall be limited to changes in methodology, techniques, or other similar aspects of the project to expedite achievement of the project's approved goals. If the awardee or the PD(s) is uncertain as to whether a change complies with this provision, the question must be referred to the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) for a final determination. The ADO is the signatory of the award document, not the program contact.

b. Changes in approved goals or objectives shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes. In no event shall requests for such changes be approved which are outside the scope of the original approved project.

c. Changes in approved project/program leadership or the replacement or reassignment of other key project/program personnel (including IPM Extension Coordinator(s)) shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes.

d. Transfers of actual performance of the substantive programmatic work in whole or in part and provisions for payment of funds, whether or not Federal funds are involved, shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such transfers, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of the award.

e. The project period may be extended by CSREES without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed five years. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the awardee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of award.

f. Changes in Approved Budget: Unless stated otherwise in the terms and conditions of award, changes in an approved budget must be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to instituting such changes if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of

amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or award.

### **C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards**

When an application results in an award, it becomes a part of the record of CSREES transactions, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Secretary determines to be of a confidential, privileged, or proprietary nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as confidential, privileged, or proprietary should be clearly marked within the application. The original copy of an application that does not result in an award will be retained by the Agency for a period of three years. Other copies will be destroyed. Such an application will be released only with the consent of the applicant or to the extent required by law. An application may be withdrawn at any time prior to the final action thereon.

### **D. Regulatory Information**

For the reasons set forth in the final Rule related Notice to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V (48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of the Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0039.

### **E. Definitions**

For the purpose of awarding grants under this program, the following definitions are applicable:

1862 Land-Grant Institution means an institution eligible to receive funds under the Act of July 2, 1862, as amended (7 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*). Unless otherwise stated for a specific program, this term includes a research foundation maintained by such an institution.

1890 Land-Grant Institution means one of those institutions eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, as amended (7 U.S.C. 321 *et seq.*), including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University. Unless otherwise stated for a specific program, this term includes a research foundation maintained by such an institution.

Administrator means the Administrator of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) and any other officer or employee of the CSREES to whom the authority involved is delegated.

Authorized Departmental Officer or ADO means the Secretary or any employee of the Department with delegated authority to issue or modify grant instruments on behalf of the Secretary.

Authorized Representative or AR means the President or Chief Executive Officer of the applicant organization or the official, designated by the President or Chief Executive Officer of

the applicant organization, who has the authority to commit the resources of the organization to the project.

Budget period means the interval of time (usually 12 months) into which the project period is divided for budgetary and reporting purposes.

Citizen or national of the United States means a citizen or native resident of a State; or, a person defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22), who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States. When eligibility is claimed solely on the basis of permanent allegiance, documentary evidence from the Immigration and Naturalization Service as to such eligibility must be made available to CSREES upon request. College or university means, unless defined in a separate subpart, an educational institution in any State which:

- (1) Admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;
- (2) Is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;
- (3) Provides an educational program for which a bachelor's degree or any other higher degree is awarded;
- (4) Is a public or other nonprofit institution; and
- (5) Is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association. Unless otherwise stated for a specific program, this term includes a research foundation maintained by such an institution.

Department means the United States Department of Agriculture.

Extension means informal education program conducted in the States in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Extension activity means an act or process that delivers science-based knowledge and informal educational programs to people, enabling them to make practical decisions.

Food and agricultural sciences The term “food and agricultural sciences” means basic, applied, and developmental research, extension, and teaching activities in food and fiber, agricultural, renewable natural resources, forestry, and physical and social sciences, including activities relating to the following:

- (1) Animal health, production, and well-being.
- (2) Plant health and production.
- (3) Animal and plant germplasm collection and preservation.
- (4) Aquaculture.
- (5) Food safety.
- (6) Soil and water conservation and improvement.
- (7) Forestry, horticulture, and range management.
- (8) Nutritional sciences and promotion.
- (9) Farm enhancement, including financial management, input efficiency, and profitability.
- (10) Home economics.

- (11) Rural human ecology.
- (12) Youth development and agricultural education, including 4-H clubs.
- (13) Expansion of domestic and international markets for agricultural commodities and products, including agricultural trade barrier identification and analysis.
- (14) Information management and technology transfer related to agriculture.
- (15) Biotechnology related to agriculture.
- (16) The processing, distributing, marketing, and utilization of food and agricultural products.

Grant means the award by the Authorized Departmental Officer of funds to an eligible grantee to assist in meeting the costs of conducting for the benefit of the public, an identified project which is intended and designed to accomplish the purpose of the program as identified in the program solicitation or RFA.

Grantee means the organization designated in the grant award document as the responsible legal entity to which a grant is awarded.

Insular area means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Palau, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

IPM Collaboration(s) refer to a section of a program proposal that contains a component of collaboration with another institution: (1) in which an applicant institution includes a cooperative element with at least one other entity that is not legally affiliated with the applicant institution; and (2) where the applicant institution and each cooperating entity will assume a significant role in the implementation of the proposed collaborative program component. Funds need not be subcontracted in all cases, and may be administered by the applicant institution. Only the applicant institution must meet the definition of an eligible institution as specified in this RFA.

IPM Coordinator(s) refers to the individual(s) with programmatic lead responsibilities at institutions with IPM programs. Programs may exist with or without funding from this program, but in reference to this program, the term is used to identify the individual responsible for executing the institutional IPM program funded through EIPM-CS Coordination Program.

Methodology means the project approach to be followed.

National IPM Evaluation Group (NIPMEG) was formed to facilitate and harmonize IPM impact assessment and program evaluation. In existence since October 2004, the group is composed of individuals from federal, state, public and private entities associated with IPM. The group works to devise long-term strategies of cooperation to evaluate the current status of IPM throughout the nation and determine how best to promote and convey broad national impacts.

Peer reviewers means experts or consultants qualified by training and experience to give expert advice on the scientific and technical merit of grant applications or the relevance of those applications to one or more of the application evaluation criteria. Peer reviewers may be adhoc or convened as a panel.

Prior approval means written approval by an Authorized Departmental Officer evidencing prior consent.

Project means the particular activity within the scope of the program supported by a grant award.

Project Director or PD means the single individual designated by the grantee in the grant application and approved by the Authorized Departmental Officer who is responsible for the direction and management of the project, also known as a Principal Investigator (PI) for research activities.

Project period means the total length of time, as stated in the award document and modifications thereto, if any, during which Federal sponsorship begins and ends.

Scientific peer review is an evaluation of the technical quality of a proposed project and its relevance to regional or national goals, performed by experts with the scientific knowledge and technical skills to conduct the proposed research work.

Secretary means the Secretary of Agriculture and any other officer or employee of the Department to whom the authority involved is delegated.

Specialty crop means fruits and vegetables, tree nuts, dried fruits, and horticulture and nursery crops (including floriculture).

State means any one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the insular areas.

United States means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the insular areas.

## **F. Electronic Application Checklist**

Only electronic applications may be submitted to CSREES via Grants.gov unless indicated otherwise in the specific program Request for Applications (RFA). All applications submitted to CSREES must contain the applicable elements outlined in these guidelines. The following checklist has been prepared to assist in ensuring that the application is complete prior to submission:

- ◆ **Are you eligible to apply for the funding offered in the RFA?** Eligibility information is stated in Part III, Eligibility Information, of each RFA.
- ◆ **Are you applying to the correct funding opportunity associated with the RFA?** Field 1 of the CSREES Supplemental Information Form will pre-populate to indicate the program to which you are applying.
- ◆ **Have you followed the guidelines for filling out your electronic application provided in the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide, which is posted along with the electronic SF 424 R&R application package on Grants.gov?** Electronic applications should be prepared according to this guide and the specific program RFA. This guide is part of the corresponding electronic application package for the specific program to which you are applying.
- ◆ **Has your institution properly registered with Grants.gov to enable you to submit an application?** Those who wish to submit an application to CSREES should first contact their Authorized Representative (AR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit applications through Grants.gov. See <http://www.grants.gov/GetStarted> for steps for preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.
- ◆ **Have all attachments been submitted in the portable document format (PDF)?** CSREES will only accept PDF attachments. See Part III of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.
- ◆ **Do all submitted PDF documents have one-inch margins and are typed or word processed using no type smaller than 12 point regardless of line spacing? Are all PDF documents numbered sequentially on each page of the attachment? Are all page limitations for a given attachment followed? Submitted proposals that do not meet these requirements for PDF attachments will not be accepted.**
- ◆ **Did you use the “Check Package for Errors” feature (see section 1.8 of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide)?**
- ◆ **Have all required components of the SF 424 Research and Related (R&R) Application Package posted under the funding opportunity on Grants.gov been completed?**

◆ **SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet**

- ☐ Have all required fields (highlighted in yellow) been completed?

◆ **R&R Other Project Information**

- ☐ Have the fields describing project potential or actual environmental impact been properly completed?

Project Summary/Abstract

- ☐ Has the Project Summary PDF been attached to this form in Field 6?
- ☐ Are the names and affiliated organizations of all Project Directors listed at the top of the page in addition to the title of the project?
- ☐ Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?
- ☐ Did you use the suggested Project Summary/Abstract Template found at:  
[www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq\\_apply.html#abstract?](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#abstract?)

Project Narrative

- ☐ Has the Project Narrative PDF been attached to this form in Field 7?
- ☐ Is the project fully described?
- ☐ Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?

Bibliography & References Cited

- ☐ Has the Bibliography & References Cited PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- ☐ Are all references cited and are all citations referenced?
- ☐ Do all citations contain a title, the names of all authors, and are they in accepted journal format?

Facilities & Other Resources (Optional)

- ☐ Has the Facilities & Other Resources PDF been attached to this form in Field 9?
- ☐ Has a description of your facilities, sufficient to indicate that you will be able to carry out this project, been given?

Equipment (Optional)

- ☐ Has the Equipment PDF been attached to this form in Field 10?
- ☐ Is the description of your equipment sufficient to indicate that you will be able to carry out this project?

◆ **R&R Senior/Key Person Profile**

#### Biographical Sketch

- ☐ Has the biographical sketch (vitae) PDF for the PD and each co-PD, senior associate, and other professional personnel been attached (including IPM Coordinator(s))?

#### Current and Pending Support

- ☐ Has the current and pending support PDF for key personnel been attached?
- ☐ Have all current and pending projects been listed and summarized, **including this proposal**?
- ☐ Did you use the suggested Current and Pending Support Template found at:  
[www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq\\_apply.html#current](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#current)?

#### **? R&R Personal Data**

- ☐ Have all fields been completed? DO NOT INCLUDE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS.

#### **? R&R Budget**

- ☐ Have all fields been completed?
- ☐ Are appropriate budgets included? For multi-institution applications, has a subaward budget been included for each institution involved?

#### Budget Justification

- ☐ Has the Budget Justification PDF been attached to this form in Field K?
- ☐ Are budget items individually justified?
- ☐ For multi-institutional applications, has a subaward budget justification been included for each institution involved?

#### **? CSREES Supplemental Information Form**

- ☐ Has Field 1 been pre-populated?
- ☐ Does Field 2 indicate the Program Code Name and Program Code to which you are applying?

#### Conflict of Interest List

- ☐ Has the Conflict of Interest List PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- ☐ Has a Conflict of Interest List been provided for all individuals who have submitted a Biographical Sketch?
- ☐ Does the Conflict of Interest list include the four categories as appropriate?
- ☐ Did you use the suggested Conflict of Interest Template found at:  
[www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq\\_apply.html#coi](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#coi)?